



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,470	10/25/2005	Martin Auer	095309.56241US	4105
23911 7590 10/27/2008 CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300				
EXAMINER				
TO, TUAN C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3663				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/27/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/533,470

## Applicant(s)

AUER ET AL.

## Examiner

TUAN C. TO

## Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/16/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by  
Frimberger et al. (US 7,017,700 B2).

With respect to claims 9, 17, and 18 Frimberger et al. teaches a system/method for detecting rollover situation in such a way that restraint, such as belt tighteners or head airbags can be released at the right time during rollover.

Frimberger et al. teaches "a decision stage which generates a triggering decision for the vehicle safety device if a travel behavior of the vehicle which is critical for safety is determined, based on dynamic vehicle movement parameters". As illustrated in figure 3, the signals from the sensors Y, Z, AR are evaluated by a threshold value generator SB which forms a dynamic rollover threshold S. The triggering decision is made if the rollover criterion W or angular speed W is exceeded the dynamic rollover threshold S (see column 3, lines 29-31, and lines 44-46).

Frimberger et al. teaches "a plausibility checking stage for checking plausibility of the triggering decision; wherein, the plausibility checking stage evaluates the triggering decision as implausible and prevents actuation of the vehicle safety device if an evaluation of time profile of parameters that are sensed in the vehicle reveals that the travel behavior which is critical for safety corresponds, within predefinable limits, to a desired travel behavior, which is brought about in a deliberate and controlled fashion by a vehicle operator". In Frimberger et al., a checking for plausibility of the triggering decision is made (e.g. the restraint device is triggered) when the rollover criterion  $W$  exceeds the dynamic rollover threshold  $S$  (see column 3, lines 44-46), and a checking for implausibility to prevent actuation of the vehicle safety device is evaluated when the rollover criterion  $W$  does not exceed the threshold  $S$  (no restraint system is triggered as illustrated in column 3, lines 51-61).

As to claim 10, Frimberger et al. teaches checking the plausibility of the triggering decision using a parameter which is indicative of rate of change in the travel behavior (see column 3, lines 26-31; the angular speed  $W$  is used in the decision of triggering the restraint device).

As to claim 11, Frimberger et al. teaches that in case of vehicle rollovers which are preceded by a driving situation with a large inclination detected, the occupant is in the unfolding zone of an airbag (head airbag, curtain), then the airbag will not be activated under any circumstances. In this situation, Frimberger et al. teaches the triggering decision is made as implausible when the large inclination is detected when the occupant is in the unfolding zone of an airbag.

As to claims 12-14, in Frimberger et al., in case of plausibility, the rollover criterion W exceeds the dynamic rollover threshold S, then a rollover is detected and the restraint device is triggered. Therefore, in case of implausibility, the rollover criterion W is below the rollover threshold S, then the restrain device is prevented to trigger (see column 3, lines 59-61).

As to claim 15, Frimberger et al. teaches that the vehicle safety device can be triggered in a reversible fashion (see column 3, lines 44-61).

As to claim 16, Frimberger et al. further teaches that the vehicle safety device is a seatbelt pretensioner (see column 1, lines 34-36).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 08/20/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After reconsidering the application with special attention, and reviewing the prior art applied in the previous rejection, the examiner has realized the current application would not be patentable over the cited prior art.

The cited reference to Frimberger discloses a system/method for detecting rollover situation in such a way that restraint, such as belt tighteners or head airbags can be released at the right time during rollover. In Frimberger, the state of checking plausibility is made to evaluate a triggering decision. Such the triggering decision is made based the dynamic vehicle movement parameters Y (lateral acceleration), Z (vertical acceleration), and AR (rate of rotation), and that the rollover criterion W exceeds the dynamic rollover threshold S. To check implausibility, the triggering

decision is made to prevent actuation of the vehicle safety device if the rollover criterion  $W$ , which reveals the travel behavior, does not exceed the threshold  $S$ .

Frimberger illustrates a time profile of parameters that reveals that the travel behavior which is critical for safety corresponds to a desired behavior or a deliberate and controlled fashion. For example, in column 3, lines 26-28, and lines 44-46, the angular speed  $W$  of the vehicle about the longitudinal axis is determined from the rate of rotation reveals a travel behavior, wherein said angular speed  $W$  exceeds the dynamic threshold  $S$ , then a rollover is detected and a safety device is triggered.

For the forgoing reason, the application is now set in a condition of final rejection.

### ***Conclusions***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan C To/

Acting Examiner of Art Unit 3663/3600

October 16, 2008

